

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY

Council of the Faculty of Arts and Science

Minutes of the meeting held on Friday, January 12, 1996

- Present:** G. Valaskakis, Chair; M. Yates; J. Abcarius; ; S. Sharma; J. Appleby; P. Bird; K. Bolh; J. Bottenburg; V. Bowker, M. Brian; D. Brown; W. Byers; J. Byrnes; M. Clarke; M. Danis; O. de Winter; D. Dicks; R. Duranceau; N. Eddy; A. Flynn; C. Fournier; D. Frost; A. Galler; B. Gilsdorf; S. Hoecker-Drysdale; I. Irvine; J. Jans; J. Lightstone; P. L'Hérault; B. Litner; C. Maillé; D. Markiewicz; H. Markwell; K. McMurray; A. Nash; R. Pallen; C. Potworowski; G. Pyburn; E. Raudsepp; I. Robinson; S. Ruby; D. Salée; R. Schmid; A. Schwartzman; A. Sharma; D. Sheps; H. Shulman; M. Singer; K. Sundwall; J. Sullivan; A. Teffeteller; J. Woodsworth
- Regrets:** G. Alfred; S.-J. De Vito; M. Fairbairn; J. Fiset; S. Lecker; M. Malik; M. Pruska-Carroll; B. Sahni; D. Salée; G. Tayco
- Absent:** A. Ahmad; N. Banga; G. Boutin; Y. Henrico; F. Lowy; D. Nemiroff
- Guests:** J. Chaikelson; A. McAusland; H. McKenzie; J. Moore for G. Alfred; H. Patenaude; R. Smith

Documents considered or distributed at the meeting:

- a) Proposal for a New Faculty Teaching Development Programme (ASFC 96-1M-A) - for discussion
- b) SCAPP Academic and Financial Planning for 1996-97 and 1997-98 (SCAPP 95-62-D2) (ASFC 96-1M-B) - for discussion
- c) Procedural Guidelines for Periodic Appraisal of Academic Units (SCAPP 95-62-D1) (ASFC 96-1M-C) - for discussion
- d) Mechanisms and Indicators for Arts and Science (letter from Dean dated Jan.9, 1996).

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 2:13 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

ASFC 96-1M-1

It was moved and seconded (Robinson/L'Hérault) that the agenda be approved.

Carried

3. Approval of Minutes of December 1, 1995

ASFC 96-1M-2

It was moved and seconded (Robinson/L'Hérault) that the minutes be approved as circulated.

Carried

4. Remarks from the Chair

The Chair wished a Happy New Year to all. She also welcomed Dr. Ian Irvine, Chair of Economics, Dr. Hazel Markwell representative for Theology, and Dr. Jim Moore, standing in as the representative for Political Science.

The Chair was pleased to announce that the South Africa project submitted to CIDA by Dr. Florence Stevens, had been successful and would result in a grant of \$600,000 with a further \$900,000 to be supplied in kind by Concordia and the University of the North. This was a joint project divided between Concordia and University of the North, QwaQwa branch, South Africa in the field of education. It would involve Graduate education as well as education at the primary level.

5. Questions and Announcements

On behalf of the students, James Byrnes wished Brian Counahan well on his recent retirement.

In response to a question on the issue of standardizing marks in one of the English courses, the Chair referred the matter to the Chair of the English department who had heard nothing about it.

6. Reports from Other University Bodies

As neither Senate nor the Board of Governors had met since before the last Council meeting, there were no reports from representatives of these two bodies.

Dr. Bird reported on Senate Research Committee. There had been discussion on how to get feedback to SSHRC which was examining how research grant money was spent. There was also discussion on where Research Services should be on the organizational chart.

7. Proposal for a New Faculty Teaching Development Programme

Dr. Ron Smith gave some background on this item, and explained that this document had been prepared at the request of Vice-Rector Academic. The programme expanded and extended work already being carried out by the Learning Development Office which was to help faculty develop their teaching skills.

The Chair moved Council into a Committee-of-the-Whole for thirty minutes.

During this time, the following concerns were voiced:

- Dr. Teffeteller's concern was that the programme seemed to be compulsory. She felt that the resources should be available to all faculty, and not only to new-hires.
- Dr. Shulman made the following points: he believed that the best teaching group were the new-hires; he was concerned that there was no university-wide policy on orientation for new hires; and in this time of budget cuts, he wished to know where we would get the additional funds needed for the project under discussion.
- Dr. Ruby pointed out that Concordia was prepared to pay people for 5-7 years to do research, yet we were not prepared to give them 48 hours of time to improve teaching. She spoke in favour of the programme.

- Dr. Sheps believed that there were teaching problems to be addressed; these problems tend to lie with senior faculty; he pointed out that this programme might be time-consuming and new-hires already had to invest time to prepare courses; content (about workshops etc.) was conspicuously absent from the document; the real problem was its compulsory nature; he asked what was meant by "scholarship of teaching."
- Dr. Hoecker-Drysdale agreed that new-hires were among the best teachers. She was interested to know the response to teaching seminars. Many new faculty had participated - perhaps there should be regular seminars for all faculty; it seemed that it should be each department's responsibility to attend to the quality of teaching in the unit. To this end, Sociology had initiated a series of area meetings dealing with methodology, theory and other subject areas. Participation of contract faculty, full-time staff and students was encouraged.
- Kelly Sundwell felt that the strongest merit of the programme was the sense of community it would generate. The younger generation expected to participate in ongoing learning.
- Dr. Gilsdorf stated that teaching was more than a practice and a process - it was important to encourage our young to improve and reflect on teaching practices. Only in the last five years has the university honoured those who put more effort into teaching than research. Stress must be put on undergraduate teaching. That teaching is to be valued was the critical message.
- Olaf de Winter, a student member of Council, saw a dilemma in that some professors refuse to accept that their teaching might be less than acceptable. Therefore, it might be difficult to persuade the right people to take the programme.
- Dr. Lightstone envisaged that all new-hires would be strongly encouraged to see participation in the programme as normal. Young faculty eventually became old faculty, and having begun with such a programme, upgrading of teaching skills would become a natural practice.
- In response to a question from Dr. Teffeteller as to whether the programme was compulsory, Dr. Lightstone replied that it would be compulsory in the same way as FRDP (Faculty Research Development Programme) was compulsory.
- In response to a question from Dr. Teffeteller as to whether there would be repercussions if a new-hire desired not to follow the programme, Dr. Lightstone stated that the Collective Agreement specified what contract renewal judgement was based upon, and that people would perceive doing certain things as a normal part of their professional lives.
- Dr. Markiewicz was disappointed that the document did not mention graduate teaching; there was a need for developmental skills for graduate teaching.
- Student, Ken McMurray was concerned about the lack of a general faculty orientation in departments. He was also concerned about budgetary constraints.

- Dr. Byers felt a programme such as was under discussion would be beneficial for new faculty to discuss problems. This group often had a rough time of it for a couple of years and sometimes retreated from undergraduate teaching.
- James Byrnes felt that whether the document was passed or not, further possibilities of the larger issue at Concordia of academic excellence should be explored.

It was agreed that this list of concerns should be forwarded to Senate.

Dr. Ron Smith responded to some of the concerns raised.

- He said that we did not have a culture of teaching. There was no communication or discussion about teaching; it was privatized. The programme would provide an opportunity for small groups to come together in a structured format to discuss teaching.
- Although the document did not say it would be compulsory, participation would be expected.
- Teachers may know about content, but not necessarily about teaching the content.
- Teaching matters at this university, yet we cannot get a grant to go to a teaching conference.
- Cost involved: Would like faculty members to be mentors as part of their normal job. (Mentors would receive \$500). This was an important activity which ought to be recognized.

The Dean explained that the budget for this new programme would come from reallocation of monies that had been allotted to Learning and Development from the VRA's budget. This would mean that fewer people would be able to go to Learning and Development conferences because of the reallocation of funds.

It was moved and seconded (Teffeteller/Sheps) that the programme, if implemented, would not be compulsory and targetted to all new hires.

Defeated: 17 in favour, 21 opposed, 7 abstentions

ASFC 96-1M-3 It was moved and seconded (Litner/Flynn) that Council approve the New Faculty Teaching Development Programme

Carried: 21 in favour, 18 opposed, 9 abstentions.

8. SCAPP Academic and Financial Planning for 1996-97 and 1997-98

Dr. Lightstone provided background on the document. He stated that this document was tabled at the last SCAPP meeting and it was sent forward for information to Senate. Senate Steering Committee decided to direct it to Faculty Councils for information and discussion. SCAPP will meet again on January 18 and will discuss the document further.

Dr. Chaikelson informed Council that the Faculty Self-Appraisal process started about the middle of September. The Lightstone/Lowy document came out shortly thereafter and Self-Appraisal's path broadened to include it. The Committee then decided in December, to look at indicators as criteria. A questionnaire had been sent to chairs to which there had been about two-thirds response. From these, indicators were noted.

Concurrently, the Rector, the Vice-Rectors, the Deans and other members of the senior administration went on retreat, and developed the ideas propounded in the SCAPP document.

A set of charts showing possible indicators were prepared by the Dean in collaboration with the Chair of the Self-Appraisal Committee. It was intended that these would be included in the self-appraisal document. A qualitative evaluation of responses was being done by the Priorities and Planning Committee, chaired by the Dean. Depending on the nature of the programme, the importance of the indicators would vary. The Self-Appraisal committee had not yet approved the charts; information still outstanding was marked by asterisks; "Revenue generating" - Principle 2 should be "Revenue exceeds costs incurred provided they are acceptable academic qualities" - a meaning very different from Revenue Generating.

At the same time that the Faculty was working on measuring criteria, CREPUQ was endeavouring to establish a set of criteria to be used to review programmes across universities in Quebec. To this end, Dr. Woodsworth attended a CREPUQ committee meeting on January 11.

The Chair gave a brief review of the situation. She explained that the Self-Appraisal process was almost over and a report would be forthcoming. Members of the Priorities and Planning committee had formed the core of the Self-Appraisal committee. When the document was received, a plan for the Faculty would be formulated. This plan would be a multi-year plan with the next academic year being year one of that multi-year plan. It was hoped to integrate the criteria/indicators that have come from the Dean's Office and the Self-Appraisal Committee into a set of criteria, - with those that will come from CREPUQ. This plan will be taken to the chairs, and later brought to Council. It was hoped to have a Chairs Retreat in March around such a draft plan.

After discussion, the following emerged as the main points of concern:

- Dr. Singer was concerned about the length of time and complexity involved in drawing up a process for restructuring. He noted that he felt it was a relatively futile exercise. He questioned who was going to do the measuring, and when would the measuring be done.
- The Dean explained that the time-frame for production of a plan was mid-March while the University was still in session.
- Dr. Gildorf was concerned about the measure of excellence. He questioned whether it should be a combination of research and teaching as in the past or whether we should be measuring the professionalism of our faculty or how much our students were learning.

- Indicators of Concordia's distinctness should be emphasized - Concordia takes a large share of "marginalized" students; Concordia makes contributions back to society; it had a large part-time clientele etc. Dr. Gilsdorf would like to see such items reflected in the indicators.
- Dr. Gilsdorf was concerned that measuring excellence would be done by looking only at research output. The Think Tank proposed a set of competencies and skills needed by tomorrow's students which were not reflected here.
- Prof. Sheps envisioned that the real problem would be the choices that had to be made, who was going to make those choices, and who would adjudicate in the end?
- Dr. Chaikelson pointed out that it was important to keep in mind that vertical cuts would not result in great savings at the outset, only in the long run. The departments have been asked to do "niche planning". She felt that the quality of the programme depended on the quality of the faculty and the quality of the department.
- Dr. Byers understood from the SCAPP document that there were two parallel processes going on. The short-term process which may well be affected by the CUFA negotiations, and a medium-term process which would come out of decisions made by Priorities and Planning Committee. Whether they will result in substantial savings remains to be seen. He doubted that those savings would be proportional to the problem faced. He thought the Self-Appraisal and Priorities and Planning processes were really a question of asking ourselves what kind of Faculty/university we wanted and planning toward that end knowing that we would have to work with a substantially smaller operating budget.
- He felt that the boxes were not definitive. Could it be said that every programme above a 3.5 stays, and every programme below a 3.5 goes? He felt that we should get as much information as possible, and have human beings make the decisions on what was important or not important. These should be presented to everyone, and reactions gauged. These boxes may already be obsolete as CREPUQ may have substituted a new set of criteria.
- Dr. Teffeteller spoke as a member of the Self-Appraisal committee and as a representative of her department. She had concerns about both documents - the Academic and Financial Planning document and the Methodology for evaluation of the document. Her gravest concern was that these documents do not take into consideration the constraints under which each unit produced its academic excellence, revenue generating dimensions, development of new clientele etc. The units had no control over these constraints; the number of full-time faculty versus the number of students, clerical staff, space etc. She felt the process in which we were engaged would perpetuate existing historical inequities. There were serious consequences. It could happen that the "haves" will continue to get, and the "have-nots" will disappear.

- Prof. Shulman felt that with so many committees working; Priorities and Planning, SCAPP, Self-Appraisal, each department, Deans etc., we were creating the illusion of a great ground swell of democracy. As a political scientist, he knew that this was not what was really happening.
- He was concerned about accountability.
- James Byrnes feared that after the University has made a \$40M cut, it would be asked to cut even more. He also shared Dr. Singer's concerns about the process.
- Also, he did not understand how the future of the university could be debated without feedback from the 26,000 students who attended. Students should be given the opportunity to voice their opinions. As a student, he would encourage faculty members to allot maybe 5 minutes to seek opinions of students in their courses re. the future of the university. It was a shame that library services have been cut. He felt that priorities have been mixed up.
- He found that the time span for discussing such major issues has been too short. We need longer than two or three months to discuss a plan, at the same time we are getting too involved in discussions based on the process.

ASFC 96-1M-4 It was moved and seconded (Gilsdorf/Hoecker-Drysdale) to forward these points of concern to SCAPP.
Carried unanimously

It was agreed that any responses from departments could also be sent separately to SCAPP.

9. Procedural Guidelines for Periodic Appraisal of Academic Units etc.

Dr. Lightstone gave the background on the document ASFC 96-1M-C. Seven years ago Senate passed legislation mandating the periodic appraisal of all academic units. CREPUQ has now set standards for all university evaluation procedures. CREPUQ requires that at the Faculty appraisal committee level, there be no members of the unit being appraised. Another converging factor was that the appraisal process collected an enormous amount of data, required a great deal of effort, and was not part of the planning process. This document was the result of SCAPP sub-committee's work. SCAPP approved the document and sent it to Senate. Senate Steering Committee sent it to Councils for their input.

Dr. Lightstone pointed out that the CREPUQ criteria were the results of a committee. The purpose of that sub-committee was very limited. To look at areas where we might cooperate, and forestall the Government doing something more draconian.

The Chair moved Council to go into a Committee-of-the-Whole discussion for 15 minutes.

Concerns voiced during discussion:

Dr. Byers:

- It was presented by CREPUQ as a simple modification, but the whole idea of the original appraisal process has been lost.
- In the university-wide appraisals team of ten people, Arts and Science would be under-represented.
- Arts and Science may be appraised by people outside the faculty who have a different set of values. Could it be modified so that each Faculty would do its own appraisal? Appraisals team evaluating departments within Arts and Science should come from within other departments in Arts and Science.. A great deal would be lost by going to a university-wide appraisals team that evaluates all units/Faculties.

Dr. Hoecker-Drysdale:

- the report was very contradictory in that on the one hand it stipulated at least two external examiners, and on the other it found that the process was too costly.
- Referring to point 4, Arts and Science would be under-represented.

Dr. Teffeteller:

- was concerned about the format of the university-wide team.
- Although she appreciated the desire for consistency, she understood that presently a committee was struck for each unit appraised.
- The Vice-Rector Academic could simply demand that the Faculty appraisal committee follow certain guidelines. Possibly a team within the Faculty would be good way to go.
- She was not comfortable with the notion that faculty members from the unit were excluded but not students. She suggested that it would put undue pressure on the one or two students.
- She was concerned about setting up a new office whose job essentially would now be appraisers to the university.
- Dr. Ruby required an explanation of No. 5. Not sure of composition of the faculty appraisal committee.
- Dr. Markiewitz explained that she was a member of the committee which drafted the document. Referring to Point 5 of the document, she said that the Faculty Appraisal Committee would be drawn from this pool. This committee would have 3 faculty members and a student on it; the idea was to have a small committee to increase efficiency. If, for example, a department from Arts and Science was being appraised, the intent would be to have Faculty members on that team. There was no requirement that there be anyone from outside the Faculty. There could be three Arts and Science faculty members on the committee appraising that unit.
- Dr. Gilsdorf felt strongly that a Faculty that had more than half of the university's faculty members had less than parity.
- Student Olaf de Winter found that there might be a procedural problem, i.e. to persuade a student to come from outside the department because the local academic associations had control over their appointments for all departmental bodies - that would include self-appraisal. This was guaranteed in referendum by the student population last year. There is a conflict here.

- Dr. Markiewitz asked whether students should be represented on the self-appraisal committee. There would be a presumption that the students in the unit would be restricted to that unit's self-appraisal.
- Dr. Schwartzman was concerned about the rapidity of flow to implementation.
- Dr. Hoecker-Drysdale found Nos. 4 and 5 areas of greatest concern. The pool was weighted against Arts and Science.
- She questioned CREPUQ's recommendation of requiring at least two external examiners, and how that would be justified in an era of budget cuts and university slashes.
- Dr. Bird wanted to know how the appraisal reports might relate to university planning.

ASFC 96-1M-5 It was moved and seconded (Byers/Hoecker-Drysdale) that the university-wide appraisal team be replaced by faculty-based appraisal teams.
Carried. 20 in favour, 2 opposed, 2 abstentions.

ASFC 96-1M-6 It was moved and seconded (Hoecker-Drysdale/McMurray) that the committee clarify student and staff participation.
Carried. 17 in favour, 3 opposed, 3 abstentions.

ASFC 96-1M-7 It was moved and seconded (Gilsdorf/Teffeteller) that if there was a university wide appraisal committee, at least fifty per cent of the committee be composed of members from the Arts and Science Faculty.
Carried. 21 in favour, 3 opposed, 2 abstentions.

10: Other Business
There was none.

11. Notices of Motion
There were none.

12. Next Meeting
It was pointed out that the next meeting was scheduled on Friday, February 16th, preceding a study week, it was suggested that Steering Committee consider re-scheduling the meeting.

13. Adjournment
ASFC 96-1M-8 It was moved and seconded (Byrnes/Duranceau) that Council adjourn at 5:16 p.m.
Carried.

